REMARKS

Claims 1-3 have been examined and rejected. Claim 4 is added by this Amendment. Accordingly, claims 1-4 are all the claims pending in the application.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

On April 11, 2005, Examiner Liu initiated a telephone interview with Applicant's representative, Mr. Brandon M. White, to discuss claims 1-3 of the application. Examiner Liu indicated that he felt the claims 1-2 would be allowable if the claims were amended to exclude weighting by order, which the Examiner asserts is taught by Tajima. The Examiner also asserted that claim 3 would not be patentable over Tajima and should be cancelled. Without agreeing to the Examiner's assertions, Applicant's representative agreed to take the Examiner's comments under advisement. No agreement was reached with respect to any claim.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claim 4 is added by this Amendment. Support for claim 4 can be found at least in Fig. 8.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the outstanding office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,222,512 to Tajima ("Tajima"). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1

It is the Examiner's position that each limitation of claim 1 is taught by Tajima. (Office Action at p. 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (MPEP 2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). Here, the Examiner has failed to establish that Tajima teaches or discloses each element of claims 1-4, and, accordingly, the Examiner's rejections must fail.

Tajima discloses the surface gray-scale method, *i.e.*, grouping of discharge cells (dots). (Figs. 25 and 26). In the arrangement shown in Fig. 25, sustained discharge cells specified in the 1st mode and sustained discharge cells specified in the 2nd mode are arranged alternately in both the scan line direction and in the direction perpendicular to the scan line direction. With this configuration, sustained discharge processing control is performed in a manner such that at least some of the gray-scale levels of each mode differ. This teaching, however, fails to teach or suggest each limitation recited in claim 1, in particular, the allocation of the number of light emissions allocated to each subfield as recited in claim 1.

Tajima also discloses the 1st mode and the 2nd mode in Figs. 22 and 23, which are associated with the arrangement shown in Fig. 25. In both of the 1st and 2nd modes, weights of subframes are "4(l)", "8(1)", "2", "1", "8(2)", and "4(2)"(with the number in parentheses are added for the purpose of comparison between the two modes). Thus, in Tajami, the weights of the subframes are always the same between the two modes. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand, based on Tajima's disclosure, that the weights of the subframes are the same between the discharge cells in the discharge cell group.

Claim 1, one the other hand, recites a drive method of a plasma display panel wherein "adjacent ones of said plurality of discharge cells constitute a discharge cell block and each of said adjacent ones of said plurality of discharge cells is separately driven according to said respective pixel data of said input image signal, and for at least one of said subfields the number of light emissions to be allotted respectively to said discharge cells inside said discharge cell block are rendered different, and are varied for each field." One exemplary embodiment of the invention recited in claim 1 is illustrated in Fig. 8. Fig. 8 illustrates that the numbers of light emissions in SF1, SF2, SF3, SP4 respectively are "20", "52", "84" and "116" in light drive format A. When the light emissions in each of the subfields are considered, the number of light emissions is made different for SF1 (specifically, "20", "28', "12" and "4") among the drive formats A-D which are respectively assigned to the discharge cells in the discharge cell group. This also holds true for the subfields SF2-SF4. Thus, Tajima fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art.

Claim 2

As claim 2 depends from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is patentable over the cited art at least based on this dependency for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 3

Claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, first to fourth light emission sustain discharge steps and first to third selective erase steps. One exemplary embodiment of the invention recited in claim 3 is illustrated in Fig. 7, which illustrates the first to fourth light emission sustain discharge steps I_1 to

I_4 and the first to third selective erase steps S_1 to S_3. (*See also* Fig. 14). In the Office Action, the Examiner argues that Tajima discloses each limitation of claim 3 in Fig. 8 (first light emission sustain step "S3") and Fig. 26 (first selective erase step "EP"). (Office action at p. 3-4). Tajaima, however, does not teach second to fourth light emission sustain discharge steps and the second to third selective erase steps as recited in claim 3 as Tajima's Figs. 8 and 26 (showing four sustained discharge cells taken as a pixel group) do not relate to the first to fourth light emission sustain discharge steps and the first to third selective erase steps recited in claim 3.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable over the cited art.

Claim 4

As claim 4 depends from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is patentable over the cited art at least based on this dependency for the reasons discussed above.

In addition, as shown in the exemplary embodiment illustrated by Fig. 8, the weighting of the subfields SFl-SF4 are set to be different among the modes A-D, which are respectively assigned to discharge cells in the discharge cell block. Furthermore, the limitations of claim 4 exist between any two discharge cells in the discharge cell block. For instance, if the discharge cell driven by mode "A" is the "one discharge cell", the weightings of the subfields SF1-SF4 are: "20","52","84", and "116". In this case, the discharge cell driven by mode "B" has weightings of subfields SF1-SF4 "28","60","92", and "124". Thus, the relationship SFal ("20") < SFb1 ("28") < SFa2 ("52") < SFb2 ("60") <... < SFan ("116") < SFbn ("124") holds. Similar relationship also holds between any two of the discharge cells (any two of the driving modes "A"

to "D"). Tajima fails to teach of suggest such weighting of subfields. For at least this additional reason, Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Brandon M. White
Registration No. 52,354

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 19, 2005